



appeal were in fact served with timely notice of the complaint prior to the expiration of the statute of limitations.” Id. Plaintiff therefore contends that an order should issue requiring a court reporter to prepare a transcript of the motions hearing conducted on May 18, 2022 at the Government’s expense, and to do so on an expedited basis, specifically, within seven days.

A review of the record in this matter, as well as Plaintiff’s Motion, indicates that Plaintiff has not made a sufficient showing to justify such relief. Plaintiff does not explain how his position that the dismissed parties were “served with timely notice of the complaint” would be supported by a transcript of the May 18 motions hearing, as opposed to evidence and other filings in the record, including information specifically regarding service. See e.g. Doc. 61 (Affidavit of Service); see also Gholson v. Trent, 46 F.3d 1123 (4th Cir. 1995) (Table) (explaining that “[a]n appellant proceeding in forma pauperis is entitled to a transcript at Government expense pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 753(f) (1988), if a substantial question is presented” but affirming district court’s denial of transcript request where petitioner failed to “demonstrate a particularized need for the transcript”).

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Expedited Transcript Preparation at Government Expense for Appeal 22-2002 (Doc. 102) is **DENIED**.

Signed: October 24, 2022

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "W. Carleton Metcalf", written over a horizontal line.

W. Carleton Metcalf  
United States Magistrate Judge

